

BL

21

.W9B6

from my friend
George Dana Boardman

THE
Parliament of Religions

. BY

GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, D. D., LL. D.

Minister of the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia, Pa.

Class 206

Book B63

University of Chicago Library

GIVEN BY

R. F. Harper

Besides the main topic this book also treats of

Subject No.

On page

Subject No.

On page

THE
Parliament of Religions

AN ADDRESS

BEFORE THE

Philadelphia Conference of Baptist Ministers

October 23, 1893

BY

GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, D. D., LL. D.

Minister of the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia, Pa.

SECOND EDITION

COPYRIGHTED DECEMBER, 1893

PHILADELPHIA:
THE NATIONAL BAPTIST PRINT, 1200 CHESTNUT STREET.
1893.

BL 21
W9 B 6

Y 1300 INT BY
TO W 100 B 3 P
PARALLEL C 100 110

EXPLANATORY NOTE.

On the return of the undersigned from the Parliament of Religions, his brethren of the Philadelphia Conference of Baptist Ministers courteously invited him to give them his impressions of the Parliament. He accepted the invitation, addressing them October 23, 1893. The following is the substance of that address.

The address was so kindly received that he has been urged by many persons in different parts of the country to publish it. Inasmuch as grave misapprehensions still exist touching the purpose and the probable outcome of the Parliament, he has consented. His consent, however, is reluctant, because his address was unwritten, and suffers from the defects of extemporaneous speech.

It is a matter for sincere congratulation that the Reverend JOHN HENRY BARROWS, Doctor of Divinity, the accomplished Chairman of the entire Series of Religious Congresses, is about to give to the world an elaborate account of the Parliament of Religions. These volumes will be of inestimable value to every thoughtful person ; not only because of the unique worth of their subject-matter, but also because of the unique competency of their author ; for Dr. BARROWS, in virtue of his official relation to the Parliament, his personal knowledge of its purpose and its method, his intimacy with its personnel, and his own brilliant abilities, is the natural, and, indeed, the only authorized historian of this most remarkable assemblage. May God bless him and his work.

GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN.

Philadelphia, Nov. 6, 1893.

THE PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS.



WERE I asked to say what I think was the most characteristic thing of the Columbian Exposition, I would answer:—Its intellectual religiousness; or perhaps I had better say, its religious intellectuality. This is apparent from many considerations. For example, the official motto of that part of the Exposition which was called "The World's Congress Auxiliary"—the motto stamped on every official document, letter, announcement—was this:—"NOT MATTER, BUT MIND; NOT THINGS, BUT MEN." Notwithstanding the Exposition was an exhibition of materialities, the strong golden cord that passed through the entire Exposition was this significant motto:—"Not matter, but mind; not things, but men." It was an unspoken but sublime protest against materialism. In that respect, it was probably the most intellectual assembly that ever convened.

There were one hundred and sixty Congresses; lasting six months. These Congresses were the crown of the Exposition. There were, for example, the African Congress; the Anthropological; the Educational; the Ethical; the Labor; the Literary; the Peace; the Philosophical; the Reformatory; the Scientific; the Sociological; the Temperance; the Women's; the various Denominational Congresses, etc., etc. I seize this opportunity to pay my very warm tribute to the Hon. Charles C. Bonney, who conceived this stupendous idea, and has conducted it with rare breadth, patience, and skill to its noble consummation.

But if I may speak of these Congresses as the crown of the Exposition, I must speak of the Parliament of Religions as the diamond in the crown. There the intellectuality and there the spirituality culminated. The Parliament of Religions!

It was seventeen days in session ; there were three sessions each day ; one hundred and seventy papers were read. These sessions were thronged, the total attendance being estimated at about one hundred and fifty thousand. If you were not there at the appointed time, you must wait till the paper which was in hand was finished before you could enter, and there would be literally hundreds waiting in the vestibules. Glorious as was Jackson Park, with all its manifold and magnificent tokens of human art and industry and science, the Parliament of Religions was, to the thoughtful, more attractive than even Jackson Park. As I have just paid my tribute to the Hon. Charles C. Bonney, it now becomes me to pay a still warmer "parliamentary" tribute to the Rev. Dr. John Henry Barrows, who, after Mr. Bonney's broad inception of the Congress as a whole, was appointed to take upon his own stalwart shoulders the management of the entire series of the Religious Congresses, including the Parliament of Religions. It was a herculean task, involving years of time, thousands of letters, delicate adjustments and re-adjustments, in time and in space, of hundreds of people of different faiths and languages in every quarter of the world. Magnificently did he achieve his colossal task. So much in way of introduction.

I. DEFINITIONS. For definitions are always of supreme consequence, especially on an occasion like this. Brothers of the ministry, you know as well as I do, that when we have fixed definitely in our own minds what the subject of the sermon is, giving it its exact title, the sermon is more than half done, even though we have not written a single word. For what does the term "definition" mean? To "define" is to "de-fine"; that is, to put a *finis*, set a limit, mark a boundary, circumscribe. Accordingly, a definition is as valuable for what it keeps out as for what it lets in. For the truth or the falsehood, the pertinency or the impertinency, the worth or the worthlessness, of a discussion depends on the definitions with which it starts. Now let me define these two words "religion" and "religions" as well as I can. What is the difference between them?

Religion, as I understand the term, is largely subjective ; it is the heart-sense of adoration, thanksgiving, penitence, confession, prayer, sacrifice, aspiration ; in one word, religion is worship. As such, religion is common to mankind ; whatever the race, the age, the form. Religion is a mark of human nature, however degraded. Accordingly, not only are Christians religious ; so also are Jews, Gentiles, Buddhists, Confucianists, Mohammedans, Fetishists, etc. The Apostle Paul himself states the matter very clearly when, in his address on the Areopagus, he says to his pagan listeners : “Ye men of Athens, in all things I perceive that ye are (what? “too superstitious?” No ; St. Paul was neither an idiot nor a boor ; St. Paul was a gentleman ; what then did St. Paul say?) very *religious*?” (For thus is he rendered in the American edition of the Revised Version.)

On the other hand, the term *religions*, as I understand the word, means objective human structures ; what man himself has either discovered, invented, elaborated, selected, or whatever other term you may please to choose in that connection. Religions are theologies. Accordingly, religions are more or less matters of topography, race, temperament, environment. Thus we speak of the religion of the Jew ; the Greek ; the Roman ; the Romanist ; the Protestant, etc. In brief, while Religion is an essential mark of Man, religions are incidental marks of men. Thus much in the way of general definitions.

II. THE PURPOSE OF THE PARLIAMENT. May I direct your especial attention to this point? Let me state the purpose both negatively and affirmatively. The purpose of the Parliament was not to challenge, but to “present ;” not to denounce, but to announce ; not to debate, but to confer ; not to decree, but to consult ; not to exhibit, but to interpret ; not to boast, but to learn ; not to parley, but to inquire ; not to compromise, but to comprehend ; not to destroy, but to up-build. In brief, the purpose of the Parliament was not to “array one form of religion against another form of religion ; but to array (if possible), all religions against all irreligion.”

Was not this a noble purpose? Brothers, have confidence in the Brotherhood. They are not altogether a set of idiots, or a set of knaves. They are endowed with some conscience; some intelligence; some earnestness of moral conviction. Of course, we cannot all think alike at every point. If we did, the probability is that more of us would be idiots, and fewer of us would be geniuses. But is the fact that we cannot all think alike at every point any reason why we should judge suspiciously those who differ from us? "Who art thou that judgest the servant of another? To his own lord he standeth or falleth."

Friends, there are two kinds of criticism. First, there is the pessimistic kind: it searches for the worst; it detects, because it loves to detect, blemishes, crookedness, weakness, infidelity, paganism, apostasy; in one word, satanism. The other kind of criticism is the optimistic kind: it searches for the best; it discerns, because it loves to discern, breadth, length, height, strength, beauty, majesty; in one word, goodness. The pessimist searches for Towers of Babel; the optimist searches for the City of God. Our blessed Lord Jesus, the Saviour of mankind and especially of his church was, I speak it most reverently, an optimist. Had he been a pessimist, taking us in the trough of our depravity rather than at the crest of our possibilities—where would have been our hope of the blessed immortality to-day? Let us thank our Master that we have at least the privilege of sharing with his servant Paul in the power or authority which he declares the Lord had given him, not for casting down, but for building up.

The object of the Parliament, I repeat, was inquiry, not denunciation. When Dharmapala, of Ceylon, asked: "How many of you have read the life of Buddha? Please raise your hands"—five hands out of that assembly of thousands were raised. Yet those thousands were quite ready to pass their judgment on that gentle soul, whose life they confessed by their unlifted hands they had never read. How we need to be reminded of the poet's lines:

Seize upon truth wherever found,
On Christian or on heathen ground.

III. PERSONNEL OF THE PARLIAMENT. For we are always interested in conspicuous characters. Let me allude to some of them in way of rough characterization. I have already spoken of the broad and tactful Barrows, Chairman of the Parliament. I must follow some sort of order, and, therefore, I will name the speakers (such as I have time to mention at all) in the alphabetical order of their creeds. There were such Baptists, for example, as the eloquent Lorimer, the catholic Moxom, the scholarly Wilkinson; such a Brahman as the accomplished Narasima of Madras; such Buddhists as the gentle Dharma-pala, and the keen Hirai; such a Confucionist as the grave Pung Quang Yu, Secretary of the Chinese Legation at Washington, who received a most enthusiastic ovation, because he stood there as the representative of outraged China; such Congregationalists as the radical Abbott, the orthodox Cook, the considerate Noble; such Educators as the vigorous Bruce of Scotland, the wise Fisher of Yale, the versatile Grant of Canada; such Episcopalians as the evangelical Dudley of Kentucky, the æsthetic Haweis of London, the brilliant Momerie of Cambridge; such Evangelists as the gallant Fielding, the brave Mills, the stout Pentecost; such Greeks as the picturesque Archimandrite of Damascus, the massive Latas of Zante, the princely Wolkonsky of Russia; such Hindus as the devout Mozoomdar, and the courtly Vivekananda; such a Jain as the acute Ganthi; such Jews as the eloquent Gottheil, the broad Hirsch, the scholarly Wise; such Methodists as the genial Arnett, the energetic Bristol, the militant Townsend; such Missionaries—I love to call their honored names—as the facile Candlin, the veteran Faber, the zealous Haworth, the judicious Hume, the accomplished Jessup, the dignified McFarland, the venerable McGilvary, the learned Martin, the evangelistic Phillips, the scholarly Post, the enthusiastic Reid, the diplomatic Washburn; such Presbyterians as the steadfast Dennis, the courtly Niccolls, the illustrious Schaff—how well I remember him as he stood on that platform, trembling from a recent assault of paralysis, saying he had been forbidden by his physician to come from New

York, and adding: "But if I die, I want to die in the Parliament of religions:" since then he has died, and this morning devout men are carrying his body to its burial; such Reformers as Dike of Massachusetts, Gladden of Ohio, Peabody of Harvard University; such Romanists as the eminent Gibbons (I say eminent, because it is the custom to call him his Eminence), the American Ireland, the catholic Keane (I do not say Roman Catholic; he is more than that; he is a Catholic); such scholars as the conservative Sir William Dawson, the progressive Henry Drummond, the erudite Max Müller; such a Shintoist as the gracious Shibata; such Unitarians as the philosophic Alger, the versatile Hale, the enthusiastic Jones; such Women (and they were a blessed force in the Parliament) as Laura Ormiston Chant, Augusta J. Chapin, Lydia H. Dickinson, Annis F. Eastman, Alice C. Fletcher, Ellen M. Henrotin, Julia Ward Howe, Ida C. Hultin, Elizabeth R. Sunderland, and that exquisite specimen of redeemed Parsee womanhood, Jeanne Serabji. Did not these, and such as these, make, on the whole, a very respectable Parliament? They were among the elect spirits of mankind. But you say to me that some of these "pagans" did not fairly represent pagan faiths. What is your own habit, my brothers? When you put forward your representatives of Christianity, do you not select the choice spirits; or do you choose from the "slums"? Why not be as fair to others as to ourselves?

IV. SPIRIT OF THE PARLIAMENT. That spirit was not one of curiosity, or exhibition, or seizure of opportunity to express loose views. That spirit was the spirit of a serious, solemn anxiety. Earnest men and women were there. Accordingly, the Parliament was marked by courage. I never heard braver men speak. At the same time there was a beautiful spirit of courtesy. We listened to each other with profound respect, as becomes men made in the image of God, who are to meet each other at the judgment-seat of Jesus Christ.

Let me, in passing, say a word about the meaning of the applause, for it has been greatly misunderstood, and, therefore,

unintentionally misrepresented. The applause was often tumultuous, but it was not the applause of endorsement for the What; it was the applause of admiration for the How; not the approval of the sentiment, but enjoyment of the oratory. I ought to add that of all the instances of applause none were so rapturous as those which punctuated the most pronounced evangelical sentiments touching sin, and the salvation which is through Jesus Christ only. The very applause proved that it was a Christian Parliament.

V. OUTCOME OF THE PARLIAMENT. Perhaps it is too soon to form an abiding estimate at every point. Ocean foam is the first to appear and disappear; ocean rock-beds are slow in forming. Nevertheless the Parliament has already yielded certain blessed results which, I am sure, will stand the tests of time. I will mention but two.

First. *The Parliament has raised our spiritual zenith by heightening our conceptions of God.* It has intensified the conviction that our God is no geographical deity, like the local gods of Egypt, the tribal gods of Greece, the pantheon gods of Rome, the national God of Palestine, the ecclesiastical God of Christendom. It has shown that our God's name is Elohim as well as Jehovah. It has taught us again the lesson which St. Peter was so slow to learn, when, in the presence of the devout heathen, Cornelius, he was divinely forced to admit:

"Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him."

Not that it makes no difference with God whether we are Christians or pagans. Not that there is no need of his only Son to be our Saviour; "for there is none other under heaven, given among men, wherein we must be saved." But that Saviour offers a universal salvation. He is the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world—that archetypal, anti-typal, real, divine Lamb who has borne away, in his own sacrificial personality, the sin of mankind; for he is the propitiation not only for the sins of the Jew and the elect, he is the propitiation also for the sins of the whole world. That is

to say : Jesus Christ not only died for men ; Jesus Christ also died for man : “ Because we thus judge, that One died for all, therefore all died ”—all mankind sharing potentially in Christ’s death and resurrection. I cannot then make the salvation of men turn on any incidental matter of chronology or topography ; enough for me that “ the Lamb of God was slain from the foundation of the world.” Here is the real inspiration of the missionary enterprise. The vital nerve of missions is not man’s guilt and danger, but God’s love and pardon. It is our privilege as well as our duty to go forth into all the world, and announce to every sinful, weary, groping soul the good news that the Son of God has become incarnate in the Son of man, in order that he might meet sinful man’s blind groping, and assure him that he himself is the Saviour of all men, specially them that believe. This is precisely what St. Paul did on Mars’ Hill : “ Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are very religious ; but you are bowing before an unknown God ; what you are worshipping in ignorance, that I set forth unto you ; your unknown God has made himself known in his own Son, Jesus Christ of Nazareth.”

The truth is, religion is largely a matter of gradation. There is, for example, what we call “ Natural Religion ; ” the religion which is portrayed in the first six verses of the Nineteenth Psalm :

The heavens declare the glory of God ;
And the firmament showeth his handiwork.

It was the religion of Abram while he was yet in Ur of the Chaldees ; for his father was an idolator. It was the religion of Canaanitish Melchizedek, priest of God Most High. It was the religion of Philistine Abimelech, Mesopotamian Balaam, Idumean Job, Persian Zoroaster, Indian Gautama, Chinese Confucius, Greek Socrates, Eastern Magi, Roman Epictetus, Arabian Mohammed, our own American Aborigines. This is why we find in heathen literature so many anticipations, dim, indeed, but significant, of Christ’s own sayings. For Jesus Christ did not come to destroy ; Jesus Christ came to fulfil : as the Laureate sings :

Tho' truth in manhood darkly join,
 Deep-seated in our mystic frame,
 We yield all blessings to the name
 Of him who made them current coin.

Then there is what we call "Revealed Religion." I do not like the term; for "natural religion" is itself more or less "revealed." There is, for example, the revealed religion of Abraham, of Moses, of David, of Isaiah, of John the Baptist, of Paul. Need I say that Jesus Christ is himself the supreme Divine Revelation? "God having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son." He is the Word of God, that is, God in consummate revelation. Thus religion is largely a matter of degrees. How beautiful Tholuck's saying — beautiful, because true — "Heathenism is the night sky of religion, and the sky is sown with stars; Judaism is the moonlight of religion; Christianity is the sunlight of religion."

We often hear it said that Christianity is the only true religion, and therefore it is exclusive of all other religions. I venture to think that it is the other religions which are really exclusive; that it is the Christian religion which is really inclusive; and, therefore, that the Christian religion is the only true, adequate religion for mankind. This is one of the great truths which the Parliament of Religions brought into clearer light. It showed that our Father is as impartial in religion as he is in nature; making his moral sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sending his moral rain on the just and the unjust. If any particular man continues darkened and parched, the fault is not in God's sun or rain; the fault is in the man himself; for he persists in living in a cave. Meanwhile, God's own sky does encompass all the earth. Do not let the Southerner, who has never been North, deny that there is a Northern Aurora. Do not let the Northerner, who has never been South, deny that there is a Southern Cross. Do not let us undertake to say what is on the other side of the moon; till at least some one has seen it, and told us how it

looks. The circumference is ever larger than any radius between it and the centre ; and each radius is worthless until it touches both the centre and the circumference. In other words, the Church of Christ is larger than the church of man ; the Kingdom of God is larger than the church of Christendom. How sublimely our Master sets forth this great truth in his own parable of the Sheep and the Goats ! How we persist in misunderstanding this parable, and so in missing its majestic catholicity ! We interpret it, because we think that the standards require us thus to interpret it, as setting forth the difference between true and false professors in Christian lands. Whereas, I humbly submit, it sets forth the difference between the good and the bad, whether in Christian or in heathen lands. " When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory : and before him shall be gathered *all* the nations " : not merely Jews, not merely Christians : but all mankind, whether Jews, Christians or Heathens ; and the Son of man shall judge them. Some he will adjudge righteous, because, though they lived in heathen lands, they served their fellow-men, not imagining that it was Jesus Christ they were serving. Some he will adjudge unrighteous, because, though they lived in Christian lands, they failed to serve their fellow-men, not imagining that it was Jesus Christ they were failing to serve. " And these shall go away into everlasting punishment : but the righteous into life eternal."

" I will not ask my neighbor of his creed ;
 Nor what he deems of doctrine old or new ;
 Nor what his rites his honest soul may need
 To worship God--the only wise and true ;
 Nor what he thinks of the anointed Christ ;
 Nor with what baptism he has been baptized.

I ask not what temptations have beset
 His human heart, now self-abased and sore ;
 Nor by what wayside well the Lord he met ;
 Nor where was uttered, ' Go and sin no more ;'
 Between his soul and God that business lies ;
 Not mine to cavil, question, or despise.

I ask not by which name, among the rest
 That Christians go by, he is named or known ;
 Whether his faith has ever been 'professed.'
 Or whether proven by his deeds alone ;
 So there be Christhood in him, all is well :
 He is my brother, and in peace we dwell.
 If grace and patience in his actions speak,
 Or fall in words of kindness from his tongue,
 Which raise the fallen, fortify the weak,
 And heal the heart by sorrow rent and wrung ;
 If he give good for ill, and love for hate—
 Friend of the friendless, poor and desolate—
 I find in him discipleship so true,
 So full, that nothing further I demand ;
 He may be bondman, freedman, Gentile, Jew :
 But we are brothers—walk we hand in hand.
 In his white life let me the Christhood see ;
 It is enough for him, enough for me."

Secondly. Again : As the Parliament of Religions raised our spiritual zenith by heightening our conceptions of God ; so the *Parliament of Religions broadened our spiritual horizon by enlarging our conceptions of Man*. For it showed that mankind is at bottom religious. Man is still made in the image of God. True, that image is fearfully defaced : but it has not been totally effaced. Deep down the grades of our fallen humanity, in the very lowest and guiltiest of our race, a generous vision shall discern, beneath wreck and rubbish, some dim sense of right ; some faint idea of duty ; some incipient, nebulous yearning after better things. And these and such as these are fragments, tiny and blurred, indeed, nevertheless real fragments of the Divine image. And these and such as these are the prophets of hope ; the human basis for the possibility of human redemption and perfection.

Moreover, these and such as these are the real basis of the human brotherhood. The question whether the origin of man was singular or plural is one of the questions engaging the attention of ethnologists. For myself, I believe that mankind, as the Bible seems to teach, has descended from a single pair. But suppose that it should hereafter be discovered that there were a hundred original Adams and Eves, the discovery

would not affect the true unity of mankind. For this unity is not so much genealogical as moral; not in human blood but in divine imageship; not in the first Adam but in the second. Jesus Christ is the Son of man, and all men are brothered in him. There were many august moments in the recent Parliament: but every morning there was a moment of supreme sublimity; it was in connection with the devotional service. The three or four thousand people present all rose to their feet, and stood for a moment in silent prayer; and then some one whom the Chairman had selected—it might be a Presbyterian Missionary, or the President of a Baptist College, or a Jewish Rabbi, or a Roman Catholic Bishop, or the leader of the Brahmo-Somaj—led this multitude of worshippers in saying reverently with bowed heads:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who have trespassed against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen.

Thus representatives of mankind, and of various faiths, bowed in unison before the one Almighty Father, on the basis of his Son's universal prayer. These were indeed moments of angelic sublimity.

Let me add that, while there is but one Divine Christ, there are two ways of conceiving that one Christ—an incidental and an essential. The incidental Christ is the outward Christ of circumstance; it is the Christ of nationality—the Christ of the Hebrew John, the Roman Paul, the Greek Athanasius, the Latin Augustine, the German Luther, the French Calvin, the Dutch Arminius, the Old England Spurgeon, the New England Bushnell, the Hindu Mozoomdar, the American Hodge; it is the Christ of theological architecture, and I suppose that we Baptists think that our creed is the finest specimen of the Gothic; it is the Christ of our own costuming—the Christ whom we ourselves robe; in brief, it is the incidental Christ of environment. On the other hand, the essential Christ is the:

inward Christ, and is therefore independent of circumstances, or conditions of time and space; it is the immortal Christ of character; the unchanging Christ of essential and eternal ethics; the Divine Christ of the incarnation, that is, God's embodiment in the Son of man. If then you would judge your brothers fairly, allow for what scientists call the personal equation. What we especially need here is what I have been in the habit of calling the altruistic imagination: or, as the Apostle phrases it, the habit of "not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others." For example, it is impossible to understand—much less to obey—Christ's Golden Rule of doing to others as we would have them do to us, without exercising the altruistic imagination, that is, putting ourselves in the others' place. To illustrate; I think that Elisha exercised the altruistic imagination in the case of Naaman, when the latter, having begged the privilege of carrying back some of the sacred soil of Palestine, so that when he should return to Damascus, and go into the house of Rimmon to bow therein, he could obey the prescribed ritual of his country; Jehovah's prophet replied, "Go in peace!" In like manner, you cannot understand that devout prophet of reformed Hinduism, Mozoomdar, until you exercise the altruistic imagination; standing with him in the line of his ancestry of a hundred generations, feeling with him the weight of all the accumulations of his theological heredity. Be considerate, I repeat, of the personal equation.

Let us be warned by the fate of the ancient Jew. How came he to be ruined? He was ruined by his own spirit of Jewish exclusiveness; by his belief that nobody could be, and his resolve that nobody should be saved, until he was circumcised, and so incorporated into the Abrahamic stock. The Jew it was who, in the spirit of pharisaic paganism, stood in the temple and said: "Stand by thyself; come not near me; for I am holier than thou." The Jew it was who never tired of shouting: "Jehovah's temple are we! Jehovah's temple are we!" But where stands Jehovah's temple to-day? The Mosque of Omar stands where the temple of Jehovah once

stood. It was the spirit of sanctimonious bigotry which stoned Stephen, persecuted Paul, crucified Jesus. Listen to the Son of man as he speaks of the Roman Centurion of Capernaum : " Verily, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west (that is, heathens), and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven : but the sons of the kingdom (that is, ye Jews, and ye bigots in Christian lands) shall be cast forth into the outer darkness : there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth."

I have trespassed on your courteous patience. Let me close with a word of gratitude and inspiring cheer. Amid all that uplifting of various sacred names, there was one name that towered conspicuously, sublimely, over every other name. Need I tell you that it was the Name which is above every name in this world and in the world to come? We criticized Mohammed, Confucius, Buddha. We criticised courteously, but fearlessly. But not one solitary murmur from South or North, West or East, was whispered against the character of Jesus Christ. Pagan joined with Christian in exalting the name of him who is the KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. No wonder that at our closing session we felt that the day of Pentecost had come again, and that we sang Handel's Hallelujah Chorus.



BL

249949

21

Boardman

.W9B6

Parliament of

religion.

JUL 18 1958

R.A. [unclear]

R. Drury [unclear]

101 50
27

NOV 11 1957 RENEWED

Kent Drury [unclear] @

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO



20 816 086